UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/526,378	01/13/2006	Antoine Moulin	Q86683	3827
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 08/26/200 ON. PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			WYSZOMIERSKI, GEORGE P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/526,378	MOULIN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	George P. Wyszomierski	1793				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	action is non-final.					
·=	<i>,</i> —					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>12-21</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-16 and 21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>17-20</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Application Papers						
··· <u> </u>						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/3/05, 1/13/06.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te				

Art Unit: 1793

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

I. Invention I, claims 12-16 and 21, directed to a very high strength steel, classified in class 148, subclass 334.

II. Invention II, claims 17-20, directed to a metallurgical method, classified in class 148, subclass 533.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

- 2. The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The Special Technical Feature common to both Groups of claims involves a steel of a certain composition. Such a feature is not novel, as evidenced by Table I of Higo et al.
- 3. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:
 - (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification:

Art Unit: 1793

(b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;

- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

4. The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Art Unit: 1793

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- 5. During a telephone conversation with Richard Turner, attorney of record, on August 21, 2008 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group II, claims 17-20. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 12-16 and 21 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.
- 6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 1793

7. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a) No claim currently under examination is in independent form. It is suggested that claim 17 be rewritten in independent form.
 - b) In claim 17, line 13, "the production operation" lacks proper antecedent basis.
 - c) In claim 17, line 19, the scope of the term "close to" cannot be determined.
- d) In claim 20, the meaning of "principally contains zinc" is unclear. Does this mean that the majority of the bath is zinc, or is some other meaning intended?
 - e) Claims dependent upon any of the above are likewise rejected under this statute.
- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higo et al. (PG Pub.No. 2001/0001049), in view of Claessens et al. (PG Pub.No. 2001/0007280) and Fujita et al. (PG Pub.No. 2004/0202889).

Higo, particularly examples 2 and 4 and Tables 3 and 7 therein, discloses preparing a slab having a composition as recited in claim 17, hot rolling, cold rolling, annealing for 35 seconds at 800.deg.C, cooling to 500.deg.C near a temperature of a Zn or Zn-Al coating bath, and immersing the steel in the bath.

Higo differs from the claimed invention in that Higo does not specify the heating and cooling rates as recited in the instant claims. Claessens and Fujita indicate that the presently claimed rates are conventional in the art of producing galvanized steel sheets; see Claessens paragraphs [0067] thru [0080], and paragraphs [0147] thru [0150], as well as Tables 4 and 17 and their accompanying explanations in Fujita. In both the Claessens and Fujita disclosures, the disclosed rates are directed to a process of Hot rolling, cold rolling, reheating, cooling, and galvanizing, i.e. a process analogous to that of Higo and also analagous to that of the instant claims.

These disclosures of Claessens et al. and Fujita et al. would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the presently claimed heating and cooling rates when carrying out the process as disclosed by Higo et al.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Wyszomierski whose telephone number is (571) 272-1252. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King, can be reached on (571) 272-1244. All patent application related correspondence transmitted by facsimile must be directed to the <u>central facsimile number</u>, (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/George Wyszomierski/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1793